REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action mailed September 23, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-10 and 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ambe, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent Claims 1 and 21 recites in general an ability to determine whether the outbound port has been identified for intercept processing, determine whether the destination has been identified for intercept processing in response to the port being identified for intercept processing, and make a copy of the information packet in response to the destination being identified for intercept processing. By contrast, the Ambe, et al. patent sends a packet to a mirrored to port when an ingress or egress port is to be mirrored. The portions of the Ambe, et al. patent cited by the Examiner specifically refer to the ingress or egress ports through which a packet is transported and fail to determine whether a packet should be copied when both the output port through which the packet is transported and the destination for the packet are identified for intercept processing. The Examiner has failed to cite any language in the Ambe, et al. patent that shows a use of a destination for a packet in determining whether the packet is to be sent to a mirrored to port. Thus, the Ambe, et al. patent does not copy a packet after a determination that both an output port and a destination for the packet have been identified for intercept processing as required by the claimed invention.

Independent Claim 16 recites ". . . the plurality of processing columns operable to determine whether the source

and the destination are identified for intercept processing, the plurality of processing columns operable to build a copy of the packet in response to either of the source or the destination for the information packet being identified for intercept processing . . ." By contrast, the Ambe, et al. patent merely performs mirroring on an ingress port and/or egress port basis. Thus, the Ambe, et al. patent does not perform mirroring based on a source or a destination for the packet as provided by the claimed invention. The Examiner has failed to cite any language from the Ambe, et al. patent that a packet is copied in response to either a source or destination for the packet being identified for intercept processing.

As shown above, Independent Claims 1, 16, and 21 have features not disclosed in the Ambe, et al. patent. The Examiner has not shown that the Ambe, et al. patent discloses each and every feature of each and every claim of the Application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-10 and 16-21 are not anticipated by the Ambe, et al. patent.

Applicant notes with appreciation the continued allowance of Claims 11-15.

This Response to Examiner's Final Action is necessary to address the Examiner's characterization of the cited art in support of the rejections to the claims. This Response to Examiner's Final Action could not have been presented earlier as the Examiner has only now provided the current characterization in support of the claim rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

November 21, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 05073